

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTINE CORONADO,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,

Defendant.

Case No.: 3:15-cv-00664-WQH-NLS

**REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION FOR ORDER
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; AND
GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

(Dkt. Nos. 14, 17)

Plaintiff Christine Coronado (“Plaintiff”) brings this action under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. sections 405(g) and 1383(c)(3), to seek judicial review of the Commissioner of Social Security’s (“Defendant”) decision to deny her claims for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits. This case was referred for a report and recommendation on the parties’ cross motions for summary judgment. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). After carefully considering the papers submitted, the administrative record, and the applicable law, the Court **RECOMMENDS** Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary Judgment be **DENIED**, and Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment be **GRANTED**.

1 **I. Background**

2 Plaintiff previously worked from 1993 to December of 2009 as an administrator
 3 who worked with the developmentally disabled. As an administrator, she did “hands on”
 4 work with clients, which included physically retraining patients, administering
 5 medications, paperwork, cooking, cleaning, and meeting with social workers, doctors and
 6 parents. (AR 35-36.) At the time of the hearing Plaintiff was 44 years old, five feet and
 7 five inches tall, and weighed 250 pounds. (AR 34, 43-44.)

8 **a. Procedural and Factual History**

9 Plaintiff filed an application for disability insurance benefits under Title II and an
 10 application for supplemental security income under Title XVI on October 10, 2012.
 11 Plaintiff alleged disability beginning December 1, 2009, in both applications. Those
 12 applications were initially denied and denied on reconsideration.

13 Plaintiff requested a hearing before an administrative law judge (“ALJ”). A
 14 hearing was held on September 16, 2014. Plaintiff and her attorney appeared and
 15 testified at the hearing. Lay witness Nina LaPinto and vocational expert (“VE”) Nelly
 16 Katsell also testified at the hearing.

17 On November 15, 2014, the ALJ issued a decision finding that Plaintiff is not
 18 disabled under sections 216(i) and 223(d) of the Social Security Act and under section
 19 1614(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act. (AR 23.) Plaintiff requested the Appeals
 20 Council review the ALJ’s decision. That request was denied and the ALJ’s decision
 21 became the final decision of Defendant.

22 On March 25, 2015, Plaintiff filed her Complaint under 42 U.S.C. sections 405(g)
 23 and 1383(c)(3) to seek review of the Defendant’s decision to deny her social security
 24 disability and supplemental security income benefits. (Dkt. No. 1 at 1.) Plaintiff
 25 contends she is disabled and that the Defendant’s conclusions and findings of fact are not
 26 supported by substantial evidence and are contrary to law and regulation. (Id. at 2.)

27 The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment. Plaintiff asks the Court to
 28 reverse Defendant’s decision and find her entitled to disability benefits. (Id. at 3.)

1 Defendant contends the ALJ's decision should be upheld because it is supported by
 2 substantial evidence and free from material or reversible legal error. (Dkt. No. 17-1 at 9.)

3 **b. The Sequential Evaluation Process**

4 To qualify for benefits under the Social Security Act, an applicant must show that
 5 he or she cannot engage in any substantial gainful activity because of a medically
 6 determinable physical or mental impairment that has lasted or can be expected to last at
 7 least 12 months. The Social Security regulations establish a five-step sequential
 8 evaluation for determining whether an applicant is disabled under this standard. 20
 9 C.F.R. § 404.1520(a).¹ The Ninth Circuit summarized the five-step sequential process
 10 for evaluating disability determinations as follows:

11 The five-step process for disability determinations begins, at the first and
 12 second steps, by asking whether a claimant is engaged in 'substantial gainful
 13 activity' and considering the severity of the claimant's impairments. [] If the
 14 inquiry continues beyond the second step, the third step asks whether the
 15 claimant's impairment or combination of impairments meets or equals a
 16 listing ... and meets the duration requirement. [] If so, the claimant is
 17 considered disabled and benefits are awarded, ending the inquiry. See id. If the
 18 process continues beyond the third step, the fourth and fifth steps consider
 19 the claimant's 'residual functional capacity' in determining whether the
 20 claimant can still do past relevant work or make an adjustment to other work.

21 *Kennedy v. Colvin*, 738 F.3d 1172, 1175 (9th Cir. 2013) (citations omitted); see also
 22 *Garrison v. Colvin*, 759 F.3d 995, 1010-1011 (9th Cir. 2014) (discussing the sequential
 23 process in greater length).

24 **c. The ALJ's Decision**

25 At step one, the ALJ found Plaintiff has not engaged in substantial gainful activity
 26 since the alleged onset date of December 1, 2009. (AR 14.) At step two, the ALJ found

27 ¹ The relevant disability insurance benefits regulations and supplemental security income
 28 regulations are largely the same, and so the Court cites only to the disability insurance
 29 benefits regulations in this Report.

1 Plaintiff has the following severe impairments: diabetes mellitus, chronic lumbar strain,
 2 mild cervical degenerative disc diseases at C5-6, mild left shoulder impingement,
 3 bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome status post satisfactory release on the right with residual
 4 carpal tunnel syndrome on the left, and obesity. (Id.)

5 At step three, the ALJ determined Plaintiff does not have an impairment or
 6 combination of impairments that meet or medically equals the severity of one of the listed
 7 impairments in 20 C.F.R. Part 404, Subpart P, Appendix 1. The ALJ further determined
 8 Plaintiff has the residual functional capacity (“RFC”) to “perform medium work as
 9 defined in 20 C.F.R. 404.1567(c) and 416.967(c).” He found Plaintiff “can lift and carry
 10 50 pounds occasionally and 25 pounds infrequently, stand/walk six hours of an eight-
 11 hour workday and sit for six hours of an eight-hour workday, with push/pull limitations
 12 equal to lift and carry limitation, and postural limitations to climb, stoop, kneel, and
 13 crouch frequently, as well as manipulative limitations to fine manipulation and fingering
 14 only frequently, due to problems with mild carpal tunnel syndrome in the left hand, and
 15 due to the mild impingement syndrome of the left shoulder, a limitation to work with the
 16 left arm above shoulder level only frequently.” (AR 16.)

17 At step four, the ALJ found Plaintiff is capable of performing past relevant work as
 18 a child attendant, administrative assistant and home health aide. (AR 23.) The ALJ
 19 concluded that Plaintiff has not been under a disability as defined in the Social Security
 20 Act from December 1, 2009 through the date of the decision. (Id.)

21 **d. Evidence of Record**

22 Both parties agree that the ALJ sufficiently summarized the medical evidence of
 23 record. (*See* Dkt. No. 14-1 at 3 and Dkt. No. 17-1 at 2 (agreeing ALJ appropriately
 24 summarized the medical records.) The Court refers to specific evidence from the record
 25 where pertinent to the Court’s analysis in the Discussion section of this Report.

26 **II. Standard of Review**

27 The Social Security Act provides for judicial review of a final agency decision
 28 denying a claim for disability benefits. 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). A reviewing court must

1 affirm the denial of benefits if the agency's decision is supported by substantial evidence
2 and applies the correct legal standards. *Batson v. Comm'r of the Social Security Admin.*,
3 359 F.3d 1190, 1193 (9th Cir. 2004). Substantial evidence means "such relevant
4 evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."
5 *Osenbrock v. Apfel*, 240 F.3d 1157, 1162 (9th Cir. 2001) (citation omitted). If the
6 evidence is susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation, the agency's decision
7 must be upheld. *Id.*; *Batson*, 359 F.3d at 1193. The reviewing court cannot reinterpret or
8 re-evaluate the evidence however much a re-evaluation may reasonably result in a
9 favorable outcome for the plaintiff. *See Batson*, 359 F.3d at 1193.

10 **III. Discussion**

11 Plaintiff asserts the ALJ erred by failing to properly consider all of Plaintiff's
12 combined impairments. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at 6.) She argues that the ALJ made almost no
13 findings regarding her obesity and failed to properly consider the extent to which her
14 obesity caused or exacerbated her other impairments. She also argues the ALJ's decision
15 is not supported by substantial evidence because he relied on the vocational expert's
16 testimony, and the vocational expert allegedly improperly divided Plaintiff's past relevant
17 work into separate job classifications. Defendant opposes Plaintiff's arguments and avers
18 substantial evidence supported the ALJ's evaluation, and that Plaintiff fails to prove
19 reversible error. The Court addresses the parties' contentions below.

20 **a. Obesity**

21 Plaintiff argues the ALJ failed to properly consider her combination of
22 impairments, particularly her extreme obesity, and the impact her obesity had on her
23 other impairments as required by Social Security Ruling, SSR 02-1p. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at
24 5-8.) Plaintiff argues the ALJ did not consider and implicitly make findings regarding
25 the extent to which her obesity contributed to the limitations of her RFC. (Dkt. No. 18 at
26 2.) Plaintiff argues that if her impairments had been properly considered, including her
27 obesity, she would have retained the RFC to perform less than a full range of sedentary
28 work. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at 8.)

1 Defendant contends substantial evidence supported the ALJ's evaluation that
 2 Plaintiff was not disabled. Defendant avers the ALJ properly evaluated Plaintiff's
 3 obesity impairment and found Plaintiff did not prove disability by that impairment or in
 4 combination with other impairments. (Dkt. No. 17-1 at 4.) Defendant also recounted the
 5 ALJ's analysis as to Plaintiff's impairments and that they did not restrict her RFC further
 6 than he assessed, and that the ALJ reasonably gave significant weight to examining
 7 orthopedist Thomas Sabourin, M.D.'s findings and opinion, which concluded Plaintiff
 8 could perform medium exertional work, was limited to frequent overhead reaching to the
 9 left, and frequent fine and gross manipulation in the left hand. (Id. at 5-7). Defendant
 10 also argues the ALJ reasonably gave significant weight to psychiatric examiner Alan
 11 Berkowitz, M.D. who concluded she was able to perform tasks, maintain a regular
 12 workweek, socially interact with others and sustain ordinary routine. (Id. at 7.)

13 Defendant argues the ALJ discussed his evaluation of Plaintiff's obesity, and found
 14 that while it exacerbated her diabetes, it did not adversely affect her pulmonary,
 15 cardiovascular, endocrine, or musculoskeletal functioning or her physical endurance, or
 16 restrict her beyond the RFC he assessed. (Dkt. No. 19 at 1.) Defendant argues Plaintiff
 17 fails to prove the ALJ did not comply with SSR 02-1p. (Dkt. No. 19 at 2, *citing*
 18 *Jamerson v. Chater*, 112 F.3d 1064, 1067 (9th Cir. 1997) ("the key question is not
 19 whether there is substantial evidence that could support a finding of disability, but
 20 whether there is substantial evidence to support the Commissioner's actual finding that
 21 claimant is not disabled").

22 The Social Security Administration's SSR 02-1p provides guidance for evaluating
 23 disability based on obesity because it is no longer a listed impairment under Titles II and
 24 XVI of the Social Security Act. SSR 02-1p, 2002 WL 34686281 at *1. The Ruling
 25 "emphasizes that obesity is still a 'medically determinable impairment,' instructs
 26 adjudicators 'that the combined effects of obesity with other impairments can be greater
 27 than the effects of each of the impairments considered separately,' and further instructs
 28 adjudicators 'to consider the effects of obesity not only under the listings but also when

1 assessing a claim at other steps in the sequential evaluation process, including when
 2 assessing an individual's residual functional capacity.”” *Arellano v. Astrue*, 2012 WL
 3 2923163, at *3 (D. Idaho July 18, 2012) (discussing and quoting SSR 02-1p). The
 4 Ruling “notes that ‘[t]he combined effects of obesity with other impairments *may* be
 5 greater than might be expected without obesity.’” *Id.* (emphasis added). “Whenever
 6 obesity is found to be an impairment, any functional limitations resulting from the obesity
 7 must be considered in the RFC assessment along with any limitations from other
 8 identified impairments.” *Id.* (discussing and quoting SSR 02-1p). Social Security rulings
 9 “are interpretative rulings and do not have the force of law.” *Chavez v. Dep't of Health &*
 10 *Human Servs.*, 103 F.3d 849, 851 (9th Cir. 1996). Courts “defer to Social Security
 11 Rulings, however, unless they are plainly erroneous or inconsistent with the Act or
 12 regulations.” *Id.*

13 Here, the Court concludes the ALJ adequately considered Plaintiff’s obesity when
 14 he assessed her RFC. The SSR 02-1p explains that “[An ALJ] will not make assumptions
 15 about the severity or functional effects of obesity combined with other impairments.
 16 Obesity in combination with another impairment *may or may not* increase the severity or
 17 functional limitations of the other impairment. [The ALJ] will *evaluate each case based*
 18 *on the information in the case record.*” *Burch v. Barnhart*, 400 F.3d 676, 682 (9th Cir.
 19 2005) (emphasis added). That is what the ALJ did. The ALJ cited to SSR 02-1p and
 20 expressly acknowledged he was considering Plaintiff’s obesity as required by that ruling.
 21 (AR 19.) He cited to the record, and explained it showed Plaintiff’s obesity exacerbated
 22 her diabetes. (AR 20.) He also used information from the case record in noting that
 23 Plaintiff’s weight was 258 pounds in April of 2010, with a body mass index score of
 24 42.9, such that her level was termed “extreme” obesity under the National Institutes of
 25 Health medical criteria. He explained that while the level describes the extent of obesity,
 26 it does not correlate with any specific degree of functional loss. (AR 20.) The ALJ
 27 further cited to other instances in the record noting that her weight peaked at 262 pounds
 28 in December of 2010, and then dropped to 230 pounds by February of 2014. (AR 20.)

1 The ALJ stated that he “considered the claimant’s obesity as required by Social Security
 2 Ruling 02-1p, and finds that the claimant’s obesity does not adversely affect pulmonary,
 3 cardiovascular, endocrine or musculoskeletal functioning, nor physical endurance or
 4 exertional capacity for the residual functional capacity found herein.” (AR 20.)

5 There is no evidence in the record that states Plaintiff’s obesity limits her
 6 functioning; indeed, the treatment notes and diagnoses do not address limitations due to
 7 obesity. Rather, the evidence in the record relating to her obesity consists of notes from
 8 doctors that observed Plaintiff’s weight or noted that Plaintiff is obese. The ALJ
 9 reviewed and considered those records in issuing the decision. (*See AR, passim* (citing to
 10 exhibits in the record noting Plaintiff’s weight and/or that she is obese, including Exhs.
 11 13F, 16F, 17F, 22F, 23F, 24F, 25F, 26F, 29F, and 34F).) The ALJ considered all the
 12 evidence and concluded that her obesity did not affect her functioning or capacity for the
 13 RFC assessed for Plaintiff. In sum, based on the record the ALJ adequately considered
 14 Plaintiff’s obesity in his RFC determination to the extent required.

15 **b. Vocational Expert Testimony**

16 At the hearing before the ALJ, Plaintiff testified that from approximately 1993
 17 through December of 2009 she worked as an administrator and worked with the
 18 developmentally disabled. (AR 35.) Plaintiff testified that as an administrator, she did
 19 hands on work with clients she and others took care of, such as physically restraining
 20 patients when necessary, passing medications, completing paperwork, cooking and
 21 cleaning, and meeting with social workers, doctors and parents. (AR 35-36.)

22 The VE, Nelly Katsell, testified that she classified Plaintiff’s past work into two
 23 jobs, as administrative clerk (219.362-010, SVP 4, light), and as an attendant at a
 24 children’s institution (359.677-010, SVP 3, medium). (AR 52.) Upon hearing that
 25 Plaintiff worked with adults, the VE also identified the classification of home health aide
 26 (355.674-014, SVP 4, medium). (AR 55.)

27
 28

1 The ALJ presented a hypothetical with the same education, prior work experience,
2 and RFC as Plaintiff. The VE testified that such a person could do Plaintiff's past work
3 as an administrative clerk and as a home health aide. (AR 56-57.)

4 Under a second hypothetical, which imposed more restrictive limitations of lifting
5 and carrying 20 pounds occasionally and 10 pounds frequently, and occasional stooping,
6 crouching, kneeling, crawling or climbing, and occasional overhead reaching, the VE
7 testified such a person could not perform the work listed above, but could perform the
8 work of an administrative clerk. (AR 57-58.)

9 In the decision following the hearing, the ALJ determined Plaintiff is capable of
10 performing past relevant work as a child attendant, administrative assistant and home
11 health aide. The ALJ stated that in comparing Plaintiff's RFC "with the physical and
12 mental demands of past work, she is able to perform the duties of all past work as
13 actually and generally performed." (AR 23.)

14 Plaintiff argues the ALJ failed to base his decision on substantial evidence because
15 he mistakenly represents the vocational expert's testimony and uses that testimony to
16 conclude Plaintiff can perform her past relevant work as a child attendant, administrative
17 assistant, and home health aide. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at 8-9.) Plaintiff argues the vocational
18 expert tried to divide up Plaintiff's past relevant work into two separate components (one
19 administrative/clerical, and the other physical) with different DOT classifications, but
20 that Plaintiff's jobs as she performed them cannot be split up. (Id. at 9.) Plaintiff
21 contends that to split up the components would be to find she can do past relevant work
22 based on "generic occupational classifications." She contends this contravenes Social
23 Security Ruling 82-61, which provides that "finding a claimant has the capacity to do
24 past relevant work on the basis of a generic occupational classification ... is likely to be

25

26

27

28

1 fallacious and unsupportable,” and that this was noted by the Ninth Circuit in *Valencia v.*
 2 *Heckler*, 751 F.2d 1082 (9th Cir. 1985).² (Dkt. No. 18 at 3.)

3 Plaintiff also argues the vocational expert identified the job of “administrator”
 4 under the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (“DOT”) 195.167-050 as being within the
 5 hypothetical RFC. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at 9 (citing AR 58).) Plaintiff contends the state
 6 agency previously found Plaintiff was specifically unable to perform this work and the
 7 ALJ had no basis for ignoring this finding. (Id. at 9.)

8 Defendant avers the ALJ did not err by relying on the VE’s assessment that her
 9 past work was a combination of three jobs because all the jobs were within her physical
 10 and mental RFC for medium work with no mental restrictions. (Dkt. No. 17-1 at 8.)
 11 Defendant contends Plaintiff fails to point to any authority that a VE cannot categorize a
 12 claimant’s past position as multiple jobs if no single classification exists for the
 13 claimant’s past job. (Dkt. No. 19 at 3.) She further argues Plaintiff’s reliance on
 14 *Valencia* is distinguishable because there, the ALJ erred when he classified the past
 15 relevant work based on the least demanding function of the claimant’s past occupations,
 16 whereas here, the ALJ found Plaintiff could perform medium work, and not just the least
 17 demanding function. (Id. at 4.)

18 “At step four, claimants have the burden of showing that they can no longer
 19 perform their past relevant work.... Although the burden of proof lies with the claimant
 20 at step four, the ALJ still has a duty to make the requisite factual findings to support his
 21 conclusion.... This is done by looking at the ‘residual functional capacity and the
 22 physical and mental demands’ of the claimant’s past relevant work.” *Pinto v. Massanari*,
 23 249 F.3d 840, 845 (9th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted). “The claimant must be able to

26 ² The Court reviewed *Valencia*, and contrary to Plaintiff’s contention, the Ninth Circuit
 27 did not discuss SSR 82-61 in that case. The SSR 82-61 does, however, note that “finding
 28 a claimant can do past relevant work based on a broad generic occupational classification
 of the work is likely to be fallacious and unsupportable.”

1 perform: 1. The actual functional demands and job duties of a particular past relevant job
 2 or 2. The functional demands and job duties of the occupation as generally required by
 3 employers throughout the national economy.” *Id.* (citation omitted). The Ninth Circuit
 4 has “never required explicit findings at step four regarding a claimant’s past relevant
 5 work both as generally performed *and* as actually performed. The vocational expert
 6 merely has to find that a claimant can or cannot continue his or her past relevant work as
 7 defined by the regulations above.” *Id.*, citing *Villa v. Heckler*, 797 F.2d 794, 798 (9th
 8 Cir. 1986) (“the claimant has the burden of proving an inability to return to his former
 9 type of work and not just to his former job.”) (emphasis added).

10 Here, the Court finds Plaintiff’s reliance on *Valencia v. Heckler* for the proposition
 11 that the ALJ improperly parsed out her job duties is misplaced because *Valencia* is
 12 distinguishable. *Id.*, 751 F.2d 1082 (9th Cir. 1985). In *Valencia*, the plaintiff held past
 13 jobs as a kitchen helper and as an agricultural worker. Both positions were classified as
 14 primarily “medium” exertional work, but also included occasionally doing “light” work
 15 sorting tomatoes. *Id.* at 1086. The Ninth Circuit held the ALJ improperly characterized
 16 the plaintiff’s past relevant work as consisting entirely of light work based on tomato
 17 sorting. *Id.* The ALJ improperly excluded from consideration other medium level
 18 exertional agricultural work that was required for the job. *Id.* (“To classify an applicant’s
 19 ‘past relevant work’ according to the least demanding function of the claimant’s past
 20 occupations is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Social Security Act.”)

21 Here, unlike *Valencia*, the ALJ did not classify Plaintiff’s occupation based on the
 22 least demanding function. Nor did the ALJ classify Plaintiff’s occupation based on broad
 23 generic descriptions. Instead, the ALJ considered Plaintiff’s description of past relevant
 24 work as it was actually performed. He also relied upon other resources such as the DOT
 25 and the VE’s testimony to determine how that work was generally performed. (AR 23
 26 (referencing DOT and testimony from VE), *see also* AR 55 (posing hypothetical based on
 27 same education and prior work experience as claimant)). The ALJ assessed Plaintiff’s
 28 RFC as being capable of performing medium work with no mental restrictions. (AR 14-

1 16.) All the required demands of the three jobs identified by the VE fell within or were
 2 more restrictive than the RFC limitations assessed. Thus, the ALJ did not err by
 3 determining Plaintiff could perform all the functional demands and requirements of her
 4 past relevant work based on this evidence.

5 Plaintiff asserts an unavailing argument that the ALJ gave no basis for ignoring the
 6 state agency's finding that Plaintiff cannot perform the work of an administrator. (Dkt.
 7 No. 14-1 at 9, citing AR 58.) Contrary to Plaintiff's assertion, a review of the transcript
 8 shows the VE did not testify that Plaintiff could do the position of administrator and also
 9 did not cite to DOT 195.167.050. (AR 58.) Rather, the VE testified that Plaintiff could
 10 do the work of an "administrative clerk," which the VE had previously identified under
 11 219.362-010. Moreover, the VE's testimony that Plaintiff could perform past relevant
 12 work as an administrative clerk under the more restrictive hypothetical is not material to
 13 the analysis because the RFC limitation assessed by the ALJ for Plaintiff did not include
 14 those additional restrictions.

15 Lastly, the Court disagrees with Plaintiff's contention that the VE was required to
 16 further elaborate on whether her opinion was based on the manner in which the job is
 17 normally performed in the national economy. (Dkt. No. 14-1 at 9.) The VE's testimony
 18 was based on the DOT, and the Social Security Administration "accepts the DOT
 19 definitions as reliable evidence of the functional demands and job requirements of work
 20 in the national economy." Soc. Sec. Disab. Law & Proc. in Fed. Ct., § 3:38, *citing*
 21 *Massachi v. Astrue*, 486 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2007).

22 In sum, substantial evidence in the record supports the ALJ's determination at step
 23 four of the sequential process that Plaintiff could perform her previous relevant work as
 24 actually and generally performed in the national economy.

25 **IV. Conclusion**

26 Based on the preceding discussion, this Court concludes that the ALJ's denial of
 27 benefits is supported by substantial evidence and that Plaintiff failed to prove reversible
 28 error. Accordingly, the Court **RECOMMENDS** that Plaintiff's motion for summary

1 judgment be **DENIED**, and that Defendant's cross motion for summary judgment be
2 **GRANTED**.

3 This Report and Recommendation is submitted to the United States district judge
4 assigned to this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Any party may file written
5 objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties on or before **May 11, 2016**. The
6 document should be captioned "Objections to Report and Recommendation." Any
7 response to the objections shall be filed and served on or before **May 25, 2016**. The
8 parties are advised that any failure to file objections within the specified time may waive
9 the right to raise those objections on appeal of the Court's order. *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923
10 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991).

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: April 27, 2016



13
14 Hon. Nita L. Stormes
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28